GOVERNMENT OF

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

ZONING COMMISSION

PUBLIC HEARING

+ + + + +

IN THE MATTER OF:

DOG BOARDING

Case No. 05-21

Thursday, November 3, 2005

Hearing Room 220 South 441 4th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C.

The Public Hearing of Case No. 05-21 by the District of Columbia Zoning Commission convened at 6:30 p.m. in the Office of Zoning Hearing Room at 441 4th Street, Northwest, Washington, D.C., Carol J. Mitten, Chairperson, presiding.

ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:

CAROL J. MITTEN ANTHONY J. HOOD GREGORY JEFFRIES

Chairperson Vice-Chairperson Commissioner

OFFICE OF ZONING STAFF PRESENT:

SHARON S. SCHELLIN Acting Secretary

OFFICE OF PLANNING STAFF PRESENT:

STEPHEN MORDFIN

NEAL R. GROSS

D.C. OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL PRESENT:

JACOB RITTING, ESQ.

This transcript constitutes the minutes from the Public Hearing held on November 3, 2005.

AGENDA ITE	M PAC	<u>3E</u>
<pre>WELCOME: Carol Mitten</pre>		4
CASE NO. 05-21 DOG BOARDING - TEXT AMENDMENT: .		4
OFFICE OF PLANNING: Stephen Mordfin		7
PANEL I: Mark Rabbage Linda Welch Christopher Stone Mary Whalen QUESTIONS:		14 16 18 20
PANEL II: Andrea Doughty		
QUESTIONS:		58
PERSONS/PARTIES IN SUPPORT: Mark O'Brien		52 57 58 70
ADJOURN: Carol Mitten		73

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

6:37 p.m.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. This is a Public Hearing of the Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia for Thursday, November 3, 2005. My name is Carol Mitten and joining me this evening are Vice Chairman Anthony Hood and Commissioner Greg Jeffries.

The subject of this evening's hearing is Zoning Commission Case No. 05-21. This is a request by the Office of Planning for text amendments to Title 11 of the District of Columbia Municipal Regulations, and that's the Zoning ordinance, to permit dog boarding uses as special exceptions in the C-2 through C-4 and Industrial Zone Districts.

Notice of today's hearing was published in the <u>D.C. Register</u> on August 19, 2005 and copies of that hearing notice are available on the table by the door. This hearing will be conducted in accordance with the provisions of 11 DCMR Section 3021, and those are the Rules of Procedure for rule making cases. And the order of procedure will be as follows:

We will take up any preliminary matters and then we will have the presentation by the Office

NEAL R. GROSS

of Planning; reports of any other Government agencies and reports of any ANCs that are represented here tonight; organizations and persons in support and then organizations and persons in opposition.

The following time constraints will be maintained in this hearing: Organizations will have five minutes and individuals will have three minutes. The Commission intends to adhere to these time limits as strictly as possible in order to hear the case in a reasonable period of time. The Commission reserves the right to change the time limits for presentations, if necessary, and notes that no time shall be ceded.

appearing All persons before the Commission are to fill out two witness cards. Those cards are also on the table near the door. coming forward to speak to the Commission, please, give both cards to the reporter, who is sitting to Please, be advised that this proceeding our right. is being recorded by the Court Reporter. Accordingly, we ask you to refrain from making any disruptive noises in the hearing room.

When you present information to the Commission, please, come forward to the table and then the mikes are probably on already, are they on

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

already? We have a little different system these days, so the mikes are already on, but we ask you to speak into the microphone and begin by stating your name and address for the record at the beginning of your statement. And then we won't be turning the microphones on and off, right? We don't have a feedback problem.

COURT REPORTER: That is correct.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Thank you. The decision of the Commission in this case must be based on the public record. To avoid any appearance to the contrary, the Commission requests that persons present not engage the Members of the Commission in conversation during a recess or at any other time. Staff will be available throughout the hearing to answer any of your procedural questions and you can direct those to Mrs. Schellin or Ms. Hill.

Please, turn off all beepers and cell phones, at this time, so as not to disrupt the hearing. At this time, we will take up any preliminary matters. Mrs. Schellin, anything?

MS. SCHELLIN: Staff has none.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. I would just mention that we did have on our schedule a Special Public Meeting for 6:15 this evening and the

Commission determined that that was unnecessary. So we are ready to move just right into the hearing and I'll turn to the Office of Planning and Mr. Mordfin.

MR. MORDFIN: Good evening, Chair and Members of the Commission. I'm Stephen Mordfin with the Office of Planning. And since the last hearing, the Office of Planning has expanded the definition of dog boarding to also include cats, primarily because such businesses do exist, although we aren't aware of any that are within the District of Columbia, and the intent of this was just to make it more inclusive.

Also, at the last Commission meeting, the Commission requested that the Office of Planning look into dog grooming. And what we did was we prepared a separate definition for dog grooming, based on definitions that are contained within other Zoning Regulations within the area and we also permit dog grooming. We determined to add it as a separate use similar to the way dog boarding is, so that if anyone wanted to put the two uses together and have dog grooming and have dog boarding, they would easily be able to operate together at their discretion.

And that concludes the presentation from the Office of Planning.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: As it relates to pet

grooming, we have been advised that that's outside the scope of what the public hearing notice included, so to the extent that you guys want to include it, we'll have to take that up as a set down item at a regular meeting, so maybe on the November 14th meeting you could bring that back to us.

It's interesting you are adding cats, which seems very appropriate, but what other kinds of, okay, we had dogs, we were focused on dogs and now we're doing dogs and cats, animals can people own in the District that we might want to include in this? Do you have a sense of that?

MR. MORDFIN: My sense was that for the most part it's only dogs that really are getting boarded. Cats, it's not a very big business from what I can tell from the other existing businesses, from the information I got from the dog providers that are within the District. So I'm not sure what other animals you might want to board that we would want to control.

The purpose of the dog boarding was because of the noise and the potential odor and waste. Cats don't have so much of the noise problem.

They tend to be much quieter. I have had cats, but not dogs.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: It just depends on how many cats you get together.

MR. MORDFIN: Right. I don't know what other animals are going to have adverse impacts, since the point of doing the whole dog boarding was because of the adverse impacts, that's really what brought this whole thing to a head. If there weren't any adverse impacts permitting it as matter-of-right, it would have seemed like a logical conclusion to this problem, but because of the adverse impacts, so other animals, I'm not sure what kind of adverse impacts you might have, if there are such businesses that are going to be boarding them.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. I just wanted to be as inclusive as possible and anticipate, you I agree, I don't know what other kinds of boarding establishments there might be. In one of the piece of correspondence that the Commission had earlier, it was mentioned that veterinary facilities might provide as a supplemental service to people boarding or they might just by virtue of the nature of what they do, which is they keep sick animals overnight, that there might be adverse impacts associated with veterinary hospitals and then the same would be true with the pet shop.

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And I don't know if you gave that some additional thought and whether or not we would need to have controls there?

MR. MORDFIN: With respect to veterinary hospitals, my understanding, having worked with them before, is that they are only keeping animals there that are sick. These animals aren't up and running around and I don't think that there is the same noise problem that you have with an ill animal that is being treated at a veterinary hospital that you have from a healthy one that is maybe being cared for by somebody else.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I think the issue that they were raising is not so much about the animals that would be there that were ill, but that I think the distinction they were trying to make was what's a normal accessory use and what would be a non-accessory use? So whether they have more of a full service type of business where they are not only treating animals, and since we don't have veterinary hospital as -- you know, the reason I'm pressing on this is because you have taken -- you seem to have focused on pet grooming and you are talking about that being, you know, that's what's going on exclusively.

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So then since we don't have veterinary hospital defined, is that something that we should think about defining, so that we can talk about that being the exclusive use and that grooming would then be a separate kind of use?

Probably so. We probably MR. MORDFIN: wouldn't want this dog boarding to be an accessory use to a veterinary hospital, because then you could side, create just, on the а dog boarding establishment, whereas everybody else has to go through the special exception process and I can just add it on to my veterinary hospital, so, if we would want to, exclude it from veterinary hospitals and have it as a use by itself and not customarily accessory to any other use.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So I'm thinking that perhaps what we need, just along the same lines as you proposing a definition for pet grooming, that we would propose a definition for veterinary hospital and we would propose a definition for pet shop and that way we can make sure that these uses are distinctly different and called out in the ordinance. So maybe when you come back on the 14th you can just add that to the list of things that you would propose.

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Madam Chair, is
2	there anything else, besides those four categories,
3	can you think of another category that you might add
4	that would require a definition? I mean, because
5	when you get into naming them, you know, you could
6	miss one.
7	MR. MORDFIN: Right. Initially, we only
8	knew, I thought, veterinary hospital, pet shop and
9	dog boarding and then we added the dog grooming. We
10	can think about that. As for the November hearing,
11	we will have to then file the report tomorrow with
12	the Office of Zoning. So perhaps you could do this
13	for December?
14	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Sure. I mean, I
15	don't think there is a rush.
16	MR. MORDFIN: And then looking to what
17	other kinds of pet uses customarily exists and maybe
18	create definitions for all of them.
19	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes.
20	MR. MORDFIN: Even beyond veterinary
21	hospital, pet shop, grooming and dog boarding, if
22	there are other ones out there that I can't think of
23	right now, then we will include those within that
24	text amendment.
25	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. And then when

you come back with the text amendment for pet grooming, you will have to be sure and tell us what curries means in the context of pet grooming. I assume it's not cooking.

MR. MORDFIN: It's not.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Anyone else have questions for Mr. Mordfin? Any questions? Okay. Thank you, Mr. Mordfin. Is there anyone else here representing the Government Agency that I don't recognize? Anyone here representing an ANC? Okay. I would just note for the record then that we do have one ANC report in the record. Thank you. And it is from ANC-1C and it's in the record at Exhibit No. 3 and they have a resolution attached.

I don't know that I can say it's necessarily in -- I guess it's generally in favor of the controls, but with certain accommodations made to existing businesses. So now, I'll ask, do we have -- I think Mrs. Schellin went to get the sign-in sheet, so I'll just hold off a moment.

Okay. Great. Thank you. Now, I need that. I can't read the first one.

MS. SCHELLIN: Mark Rabbage.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mark Rabbage? We'll take a few people at the table. Did I mispronounce

that?

MR. RABBAGE: No, that's fine.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Have a seat at the table, please. Christopher Stone?

MR. STONE: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Linda Welch?

MS. WELCH: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes, we have four seats and we like to fill them up. And Tim McGuire? Okay. Mary Whalen? And the way we typically do this is we do a whole panel and then we ask our questions at the end. So we have Mr. Rabbage is representing himself, so he will have three minutes. And then Mr. Stone and Ms. Welch are representing organizations and Ms. Whalen is representing herself. So just to get the timing right.

Do we have a clock or not? Oh, okay.

Mrs. Schellin will give you a one minute warning when
you are down to one minute. Okay. Mr. Rabbage, why
don't you go first? And you need to speak into the
microphone, so you'll each have to share.

MR. RABBAGE: Hello and thank you very much for allowing me to speak. I'm a resident of Q Street, so I live at 1408 Q Street, and I have come here with sort of the backing of the residents of my

condominium complex, Row 12 Apartments, so perhaps I have misrepresented myself as just being self. There is an agreement between this condominium community on the points I'm going to make.

And that is we live very close to a particular dog kennel. We have experienced firsthand a large amount of barking and we would very much like to point out that we had a sound engineer come out especially and do scientific recordings of the noise and it is particularly loud. Not only is it very loud from this indoor and outdoor dog boarding and grooming facility, it's the type of noise as well.

I hope none of you would ever have to be in a situation that we have been in where we have had to use earplugs to sleep in our own bedrooms. This is an ongoing situation as well. I understand that you have to take time and deliberate these decisions, but I would also ask where possible you use expediency for our sakes really.

The noise is of a particular nature, even one dog barking is enough to keep you up at night. It's a peculiar kind of thing. I perhaps should explain myself. I'm a combat cameraman for the British Broadcasting Corporation and I have been in a number of situations where I've experienced loud

noises and I have even managed to sleep through some 1 2 them. Being woken up to getting artillery barrages and so forth. But it's not quite the same 3 thing. have never yet been able to sleep 5 6 through a dog barking from 25 foot away, you know, outside yard. And it has been my pleasure to 8 actually have conversations with responsible 9 boarding facilities. And I only wish that, in this particular case, we had a facility like some of the 10 11 people represented here. But as some of my colleagues here pointed 12 13 out, but they would never even dream of thinking up facilitating a dog boarding and grooming facility so 14 15 close to a residential area. And I would just ask you to exact very firm rules that allow all of us to 16 17 be able to sleep more easily and for good dog kennel 18 owners to be able to conduct their business in a good environment. And I think that's really it, I think. 19 20 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Thank you. 21 Are you Ms. Welch? 22 MS. WELCH: I am. 23 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You're next.

I am Linda Welch and I am Dogs By Day and Night, a 24

MS. WELCH:

Good evening to all of you.

24

hour day care and boarding facility for dogs, and also pet essentials which is a pet supply store and grooming shop. I would like to make a couple of points, one around what we had discussed earlier about grooming.

To take a good hard look at that, I can see where there would be loopholes, having a grooming facility myself, if I wanted to open one up in a residential area, how I could say well, the dogs are there for several hours and they are just waiting to be groomed. So definitely keep that in consideration when you are making a ruling on that, because I think that might be a way that some people might try to get regulations around the rules and that we are implementing here.

The other thing, too, is that I just want to point out that there are some of us that are operating and have been operating for several years very responsibly in this dog business. And I agree with the residents that it is crucial that the noise be kept to a minimum and the odor has to be eliminated. And to just keep that in mind for those of us who have Cs of Os and who have had business licenses since '98 and '99 to grandfather us and allow us to continue to operate responsibly as we

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

have been doing in the past.

I also wanted to say that I am in support of the letter of the Q Street Association.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.

MS. WELCH: Okay. Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Mr.

Stone?

MR. STONE: Hello, Madam Mitten and the rest of the Board, good evening. I am the owner of City Dogs located in Dupont on 18th Street. It is also a dog day care and a 24 hour boarding center as well. We established back in '99 and have been there ever since. I want to touch on two things. One was the definition of grooming. I feel that without addressing the grooming situation a little bit more thorough than we have, it does create, as Linda had also said, a loophole.

And I think from an economic standpoint, as a business owner, it leaves my business at a disadvantage, because as I'm not classified as a grooming facility, and no, I do not provide grooming services, and I do operate within the full intent of what the proposal is for a dog boarding center, a grooming facility may choose to disguise themselves as a grooming facility, but yet operate as a boarding

or a daytime day care center.

And that concerns me, because I have sanitation requirements that will be applicable to me under the new proposal as well a noise regulations and also location requirements. And leaving the grooming out really leaves them open to basically finding a location anywhere within a Commercial Zone and grooming dogs. And even from a regulatory and monitoring standpoint, it is somewhat challenging for the city to be able to, after this goes into effect, really be able to regulate it as we have seen in the past.

And how would you be able to regulate where a dog is coming in and out of the front door and oh, it just got groomed. I mean, how do you determine that? That's something I am concerned about. I want the, from a business standpoint, playing field to be equal for both myself and for the grooming facilities as well.

And then the last point really just kind of touches on me being an existing entity. At the time at which we started the business back in 1999, we did what we thought was the right thing, which was to go to the DCRA and obtain a Certificate of Occupancy and classify ourselves as all that was

known as a dog day care center, much as Linda did as well. And we operated under that C of O until July 11th of this year, at which time we went and got a new C of O that did give us the ability to be a 24 hour dog boarding and day care facility.

But I just hope that in the final decision when you do conclude and put the regulations in effect that you do certainly protect the businesses that have been operating properly for the last six years. Speaking on behalf of my 2,000 clients and 19 employees, I think they would also certainly appreciate that as well.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. And Ms. Whalen?

MS. WHALEN: Thank you. I appreciate the opportunity to speak. My name is Mary Whalen. I live at 312 8th Street, S.E., on Capitol Hill. I'm a 15 year resident of the District of Columbia and of Capitol Hill and I'm a client of Dogma. I support most of the proposal before you, but not banning outdoor yards, unless Dogma is grandfathered. I appreciate the difficult issues that you have to wrestle with as a Commission. But I also ask you to consider the equity in viewing Dogma differently than other facilities.

Dogma is a unique facility in a Commercial Zone with an outdoor yard which is fenced and screened, visually screened, and which existed long before dog boarding came before this Commission. Its location is across the street from the Southeast Freeway. It is 20 yards from an autobody and repair shop with a yard filled with cars that are somewhat wrecked. There is no nearby residential area. The residential areas are all on the far side of the freeway.

There is virtually no to be one disturbed, first of all. The Dogma has been running in a responsible manner with a soundproof cinder block building from day one, with fenced and shielded property from day one and I think the equity of the situation to me is that you consider this D.C. Essentially, they began this business from nothing in an abandoned lot at a time when there weren't a whole lot of businesses on Capitol Hill.

I was there. I lived there. I know. 8th Street was not exactly, you know, the center of life in the city and they anchored an end of Capitol Hill, which was a particularly abandoned ill-used and particularly unsafe area. They brought a business to life and they have a unique outdoor facility, which

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

is protected, noise protection, and the people are 1 not bothered by the dogs. Dogs don't bother the 2 people. There is virtually no barking. 3 But nonetheless, there could be, but they operate in a responsible manner. I really would ask 5 you to consider grandfathering Dogma, protecting them 6 in some way and allowing them to operate the way they 8 always have. I think it is simply equity to allow it 9 and it's a great place. 10 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Thank you. 11 Questions for the panel? 12 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Yes, Ι 13 couple of questions. Okay. Mr. Rabbage, so you are at a condominium association at 1408 Q Street? 14 15 MR. RABBAGE: That's correct. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: 16 And you 17 adjacent to like an exterior yard that has dogs? 18 MR. RABBAGE: There is one narrow building in between our condominium building and a 19 particular dog boarding/grooming facility. 20 distance between our building 21 and say the 22 boarding/grooming facility is about 25 or 30 foot, no 23 more. 24 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. 25 MR. RABBAGE: And they have both indoor

and outdoor facilities. 1 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Well, how close 2 are you to Mrs. Welch's location Dogs By Day? 3 That's a more substantial MR. RABBAGE: I think in meters it's more like 300 5 meters away. That's about two or three blocks away. 6 MS. WELCH: We're in the middle between R 7 8 and S Street. 9 MR. RABBAGE: R and S. 10 MS. WELCH: On First Street, yes. 11 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. First of 12 all, I go to dog, pet essentials. You might not 13 remember me. MS. WELCH: Oh, I do. Thank you. 14 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: 15 Protein bones. You told me to use the protein, not the rawhide for 16 17 the first year. 18 MS. WELCH: I hope it's working. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: 19 Not for me, but 20 for my dog. So I just wanted to make certain I was clear about the distance, because I'm like, now, they 21 are very friendly, but, you know, I just sort of 22 23 confused the alphabet there. 24 So, Mr. Rabbage, how long has this

boarding been in place?

1	MR. RABBAGE: Over two years. I think
2	it's almost two and a half years now.
3	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Have you seen an
4	increase in the noise level or it's just been pretty
5	consistent?
6	MR. RABBAGE: I would say it started off
7	at a low level and ramped itself up quite
8	substantially at the point there was barking at
9	night, at 4:00 in the morning, at all times of the
10	day. Recently, because I think of the issues being
11	looked at by your Board, things have gotten quieter.
12	But I would still say, I mean, there were dogs
13	barking last Friday. I came back from I was in
14	Cancun and tired.
14	Cancun and tired.
14 15	Cancun and tired. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay.
14 15 16	Cancun and tired. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. MR. RABBAGE: So I came back and was
14 15 16 17	Cancun and tired. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. MR. RABBAGE: So I came back and was woken up at 8:30 in the morning by some dogs barking
14 15 16 17	Cancun and tired. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. MR. RABBAGE: So I came back and was woken up at 8:30 in the morning by some dogs barking in the back there.
14 15 16 17 18	Cancun and tired. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. MR. RABBAGE: So I came back and was woken up at 8:30 in the morning by some dogs barking in the back there. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: How about
14 15 16 17 18 19	Cancun and tired. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. MR. RABBAGE: So I came back and was woken up at 8:30 in the morning by some dogs barking in the back there. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: How about sanitation issues?
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Cancun and tired. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. MR. RABBAGE: So I came back and was woken up at 8:30 in the morning by some dogs barking in the back there. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: How about sanitation issues? MR. RABBAGE: It depends which way the
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Cancun and tired. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. MR. RABBAGE: So I came back and was woken up at 8:30 in the morning by some dogs barking in the back there. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: How about sanitation issues? MR. RABBAGE: It depends which way the wind is blowing.
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Cancun and tired. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. MR. RABBAGE: So I came back and was woken up at 8:30 in the morning by some dogs barking in the back there. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: How about sanitation issues? MR. RABBAGE: It depends which way the wind is blowing. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay.

1	for the residents. I know other residents do get a
2	lot of odor. Generally, I don't. I try to keep
3	those windows shut as much as I can.
4	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. Okay.
5	And, Mrs. Whalen, you know, the current sort of
6	situation in and around your Dogma is that, you know,
7	there is not much residential. It's sort of empty.
8	But there could be a time down the road that you see
9	increased development and so forth.
10	MS. WHALEN: Theoretically, yes.
11	However, Dogma is bounded on one side by the freeway.
12	Unless we're going to tear the freeway down, I don't
13	think we're building there. There is a park on one
14	other side.
15	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Where is it
16	located exactly? What's the exact location?
17	MS. WHALEN: Virginia Avenue.
18	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Between 8 th Street
19	and 9 th Street.
20	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Oh.
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Between 8 th Street
22	and 9^{th} Street, for the record, is what was said from
23	the audience.
24	MS. WHALEN: Thank you. I didn't
25	remember. It literally is on that little spur of

street that runs back onto the freeway. 1 2 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. MS. WHALEN: And the part goes up across 3 the 11th Street Bridge and part goes down onto the end of the freeway. There is a small park on one side of 5 the facility. There is a parking lot behind it. 6 There is no commercial -- I mean, no residential 8 anything. 9 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Yes. MS. WHALEN: And I agree, it's a very 10 different situation faced by the gentleman. 11 12 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Yes, I'm just 13 sort of -- you know, obviously, we all know that, you know, there is so much development happening and like 14 any available lot is being considered and there's a 15 lot of mixed use developments and so there could come 16 a time. 17 18 MS. WHALEN: Theoretically. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: 19 I mean, I can't fully make out the area, but that's just --20 MS. WHALEN: I believe she is going to 21 show you some pictures. 22 23 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. Well, that 24 would be great. 25 MS. WHALEN: And I think that will help.

But this is not going to be the first property. 1 2 I understand the point. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Yes. 3 MS. WHALEN: I'm just saying that at this time, as you consider this regulation, I think there 5 are places in the city where there are no real 6 residential use underway where a facility could have 8 an outdoor yard without disturbing anyone. 9 think, you know, you could survey the residents, only 10 there aren't any residents to survey. I think it's an issue that you should 11 12 consider that there are places in the city where 13 viable businesses like this one came into a blighted area, created human traffic, created not only jobs in 14 the District, but really it is helpful to have 15 comings and goings, we all know that, in particularly 16 isolated areas. 17 18 COMMISSIONER appreciate JEFFRIES: Ι 19 I'm a big proponent of economic development. 20 MS. WHALEN: Well, I know you are. 21 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Mr. Stone, 22 heard you say --23 MS. WHALEN: That's exactly --24 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: -- 19 employees. 25 got it. I just, you know, wanted to point that

1	out that, you know, things don't always stay as they
2	are today and you might be looking at a very
3	different context down the road. And so one other
4	question. Dogma has because there are no
5	residents, there have been no complaints ever?
6	MS. WHALEN: None that I'm aware of ever
7	in its years of operation.
8	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: The wind blowing
9	a certain direction doesn't
10	MS. WHALEN: Well, there's nobody there.
11	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. Okay.
12	Okay.
13	MS. WHALEN: And then there's some guys
14	that live under the freeway.
15	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. Okay.
16	MS. WHALEN: You could talk to them.
17	COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. Okay.
18	Thank you.
19	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Hood?
20	VICE CHAIR HOOD: Thank you. Is this on?
21	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: He has to turn you
22	up.
23	VICE CHAIR HOOD: Is this on? Oh, you
24	have to turn me up. Thank you. I appreciate the
25	education that I'm getting thus far. Unfortunately,

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

like my colleagues, I don't have very much experience with dogs and the dog boarding issues and the grooming issues and all of this. But, Mr. Stone, you said something that I'm curious.

From your experience, what do other jurisdictions -- how do they handle dog boarding? I know they have the land mass and everything, so they

MR. STONE: Well, I think it depends on whether we're dealing --

don't run into some of the same problems we do, but

just elaborate for me. How do they handle it?

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Would you put the mike in front of you?

MR. STONE: Oh, I'm sorry. I think it depends on whether we're dealing with a city or the suburbs. If you go out into Virginia or Maryland, they are a little bit more relaxed, you know, maybe excluding Bethesda and Silver Spring and some of the areas by county.

But when you get into cities, if you look at Baltimore and even New York City, they have much stricter requirements and, primarily, a lot of it is indoor in the city areas. I think in the letter that we sent to Ms. Mitten, excuse me, I apologize --

VICE CHAIR HOOD: That's fine.

NEAL R. GROSS

MR. STONE: I wasn't even looking. Okay. There it is. That we touched on in there pretty detailed what some of the other local jurisdictions have done. Baltimore County was one. New York City was another and they are all in the letter. And I'm coming from memory, but having helped write that and read it several times, it's very detailed in there as to what they have done.

You know, soundproofing is important, you know, something that is not as easy to be controlled, but ownership and management is certainly important as well. It's a difficult variable to control at this type of level but, you know, noise and odor control, odor can be controlled. I mean, speaking for myself and for Linda, you know, we control it. I mean, you know, we have to.

That's part of the responsibility we are as business owners, to make sure that it's controlled and it is controlled. And it if needs to be escalated to where it's put into the regs, so that people are required to do it because they are not taking the initiative on their own as a business owner, then certainly it needs to be there.

The same with soundproofing. I mean, you know, we have soundproofing, but if others choose or

have chosen not to do that and there needs to be something to motivate them to do that, then certainly it should be in there as well. That's really all I can say.

VICE CHAIR HOOD: Okay. You mentioned, and it may be in your submittal, but you mentioned that you have about 2,000 clients.

MR. STONE: Yes.

VICE CHAIR HOOD: Is there a cap of how many clients you serve at one time?

MR. STONE: There is a cap, yes. 2,000 clients would encompass both, you know, boarding, which we do as one service, and day care as another. Generally, on an average day for our facility, we have two large rooms where we house the dogs all indoors, one is downstairs, one is upstairs, and we usually have about 25 dogs a room, so about 50 dogs on a day.

And then when the day care day ends at 7:00 p.m., the dogs are picked up usually mostly between 5:00 and 7:00 at the end of the work day and, approximately, during the week I would say between 10 and 15 dogs stay overnight, because the owner is out of town, they are traveling for business. So we board about 10 or 15 during the week and then, of

1 course, on the weekends we go to our maximum, which is 25. 2 VICE CHAIR HOOD: 3 Okay. MR. STONE: Who are boarding the weekends. 5 VICE CHAIR HOOD: Okay. Thank you. Mr. 6 7 Rabbage, you mentioned that you had problems with 8 noise issues. 9 MR. RABBAGE: Yes. Indoor, you can hear 10 VICE CHAIR HOOD: them when they are inside as well as outside. 11 The noise report we had 12 MR. RABBAGE: 13 done was done by a neighboring building, basically adjacent to this particular dog grooming and boarding 14 They recorded noise from inside this 15 facility. person's home and also outside listening to the yard 16 17 the noise coming from like inside the 18 grooming and outside the dog grooming facility. And I believe it's under BZA Appeal No. 19 17092, this particular report, and I think it was 20 very persuasive in that appeal about the level of 21 22 noise you can get, let alone the type of noise, but 23 simply the level of it.

concern as well, I didn't pick up from -- I should

And if I may, just on that point, our

24

have said earlier on is that we're very concerned that we suffer this kind of noise simply because an establishment changes from being a boarding into a grooming facility.

It's the same fear we have, that this loophole would become, in fact, there and that we would be listening to one dog barking or 10 dogs barking. To us it makes no difference if it's boarding or if it's grooming. The noise will still be there if they are not considered to be the same and have the same strict regulations applied.

VICE CHAIR HOOD: Okay. All right.

Thank you. And, Mr. Stone, I do share your -- I think you raised a concern about the enforcement issue. I share that now and not just with this case, but all of them. We sit here and write regs and a lot of times --

MR. STONE: Sure.

VICE CHAIR HOOD: Sometimes I will -- we live in the city, too. I wanted to know what's happening, so I do share your concerns. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you, Mr. Hood.

I just wanted to follow-up with Mr. Rabbage on the subject that Mr. Hood was just talking to you about.

The way that the proposed regulation reads right now

is that the use would not be permitted if it abutted a residence zoned district, but you are somewhat removed. Isn't there an intervening property?

MR. RABBAGE: For my residence, yes, but there are other residences which do abut. I'm on the east side of this particular building. There is an intervening building, but the people on the west side residences do abut, immediately abut that particular facility.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Right. And I'm not focused so much on the specifics of that circumstance, but what you're describing to us makes me wonder is the prohibition that simply -- let's intervening property pretend that the is residential and it is, in fact, commercial, and so someone could come in and, you know, perhaps qualify under a special exception for this use, because it wouldn't be prohibited, but it's still close enough that it's a problem for the residents. They are not abutting, but they are within a certain distance.

MR. RABBAGE: I can --

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Can you suggest from your experience what this establishment -- what that distance is?

MR. RABBAGE: I struggle with that one.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

For us, we're about, approximately, 25 foot away and that is too close. But again, you know, I would dream of living next to the colleagues I have to my right, because I know there are buildings in similar situations and they have experienced very little noise because of the precautions they are taking.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Um-hum.

MR. RABBAGE: But the particular facility I'm thinking of has taken no such things and they do have an outdoor run. The people who live -- abut it, the residents who abut this particular facility, suffer from a great deal of noise inside their building.

I struggle to sort of help you in defining how far away it should be. I think it's a question of looking at perhaps engineering reports like the one we submitted. I think there are -- there are scientific points on that one.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Go ahead.

MS. WELCH: Can I speak to that?

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Yes. I just need you to speak into the microphone.

MS. WELCH: Yes, absolutely. I think, too, with my building, a dog's bark can resonate deeply on long -- for far away. Cement block can

absorb a lot of that. There's a lot of ways to soundproof it.

We have almost 80 dogs a day and we have neighbors on both sides, we have business on both sides that never hear them, and that is because when we got our facility and we put dogs in it and we let them bark first and we went outside and we listened. And we said oh, well, there is sound here, there is not sound here, fix it.

I think you really have to have that in the regulations, some sort of soundproofing of these establishments, to make sure that there is no decibels beyond X outside. It's hard to say a dog barking. My dogs, I have two St. Bernards. If they bark now we could probably hear them and they are on 14th Street. So I don't know whether you can really gauge it on that.

Now, the waste is another and the odor is another problem as well. But again, there are things that can be done. There are big, huge hepafilters and things that can be installed that take care and circulate the air. There are people that come by and collect the waste on a daily basis and there's containers that can be put in.

I mean, these kinds of things can be

	regulated and established to make a facility like
2	ours we have neighbors right next to us. We have
3	a coffee shop and it doesn't bother them at all. So
4	just maybe that could be helpful.
5	CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Because I
6	think if we could have in the special exception
7	requirements that there have to be certain, and maybe
8	you can work with these folks to figure out things
9	like, you know, air filtration, waste removal,
10	soundproofing, so that we can make it easier for the
11	BZA to understand what kinds of things they should be
12	focusing on and what the standards are. That would
13	be helpful.
14	VICE CHAIR HOOD: Madam Chair, can I just
15	say something? Can you turn it up? You got me up?
16	Okay. You mentioned hepafilters. Are you actually
17	using that now, a filter, a hepafilter at your
18	facility?
19	MS. WELCH: Oh, yes. We have several
20	huge hepafilters.
21	VICE CHAIR HOOD: How often do you have
22	to change that?
23	MS. WELCH: We change them every three
24	weeks.
25	VICE CHAIR HOOD: Every three weeks?

MS. WELCH: Yes. Yes, we go through a 1 2 lot of money for the filters, but it's worth it. All right. VICE CHAIR HOOD: Okay. 3 Thank you. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Excuse me. 5 Chair, I just wanted to bring attention to the letter 6 dated October 31st. It just talked about some of the 8 other jurisdictions and how they dealt with setback 9 requirements, San Francisco, Baltimore, San Diego. I mean, it's all over the map as it 10 relates to the kind of distance that's required, so I 11 just wanted to note that for the record. Like, for 12 13 example, here in Maryland, setback distance, 200 feet from the nearest property line. So anyway, just in 14 terms of additional information. 15 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I think, and what is 16 becoming clear is there is -- what the ordinance 17 18 needs to do is it needs to set the stage for, you know, we often have cases where we're granting a use 19 20 for a property and if you have good management, everything is fine. If you have bad management, 21 22 everything is not fine. 23 And so we're trying to put as 24 objective standards in place so that -- you know,

on

the

same

rely

people can't

25

in

management

perpetuity, so we just need to do the best we can to ward off some of the negative impacts.

I just also wanted to follow-up on a question that Mr. Hood had asked, which is is there - - I take it there has got to be a size beyond which the facility is unmanageable or a density of animal per square foot or something, and I don't know how you establish those standards.

But thinking again ahead to someone who might not be the best manager and is just taking more animals than they can really handle appropriately, do you have any suggestions for us on either restrictions on overall size or on animals per square foot or something like that? Any thoughts on that?

MS. WELCH: I have looked into that, animals per square foot, because I do consulting for day cares that are all over the country. That is hard to say. The best gauge for something like that is how well-trained the staff is in managing animals. At times there could be five staff in the back and if they are not well-trained, they can't manage five dogs. Other times there could be one really well-trained handler in the back with 60 dogs and the dogs are all quiet.

It's really hard to gauge. Of course,

you don't want the dogs on top of each other, but in situations like ours when there is such limited space, we know what our facilities can handle just based on the experience of our handlers, which is what's called the people that are in the back with the dogs. So we know our limit.

We have had 97. That was the top number that we have ever had. It was a crazy day. We don't want that every day. So we think, okay, 80. You know, that's a good cutoff point, but we know that only through experience. It's really hard, and I know Chris can talk to this, too, but it's just really hard to say dogs per square foot.

I don't think that can be part of the regulation only because you're limiting those who are very qualified and allowing those who maybe are not to take more than they can.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Is there a minimum staff for X number of dogs?

MS. WELCH: There is not really a requirement that is set. Again, it depends on how comfortable the handler is. We have seen as much as, you know, one staff person for every 10 dogs and one staff person for every 20 dogs. It's not the same as a child day care.

This is -- it's an evolutionary process since day care has only been around in this area for 8, 9, 10 years. You know, it's relatively new. So, you know, Chicago and LA led the way of that and then we followed suit. Rebecca actually was the first in our area. So it's still being fine tuned and there aren't any industry standards.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Mr. Stone, did you want to --

MR. STONE: Yes, just a quick comment. I think getting back to the regulation or the regulatory aspect, Ι think it would be challenging to implement something that would say that there was a requirement for a certain amount of square foot per dogs. I mean, unless someone is going to come and count the dogs on a daily basis, I think it would be a challenge to do that.

You know, going back to me having 19 staff, you know, some people are somewhat shocked that I have that many employees for the size of my business, and it's because we have a lot of people that work with the dogs and that is more -- we put more emphasis there to keep, you know, an adequate amount of staff controlling the dogs.

But there is, I mean, my facility is not

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

as big as Linda's and, therefore, you know, I don't accommodate as many dogs. Did I ever, you know, sit down and do a per square foot? Not really. You know, we basically just found a comfortable and manageable level, adequate staff to cover that and it has just been working.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.

MR. STONE: As far as quantifying it, it could be somewhat of a challenge. And we talked about this actually, the issue that you're bringing up, in writing the letter and making suggestions, but we kind of steered away from that, because we just weren't sure of a good way to do that or something to that.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. You know, we're just exploring ideas.

MR. STONE: That's good.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Anyone else?

COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Although, let mo

COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Although, let me stick with that for a minute. But there is some minimum size or there is some basic layout or something. I mean, what if someone decided to open up a dog boarding facility that was absolutely entirely, you know, too small or just didn't have the right floor plan configuration? I mean, I --

MR. STONE: Well, I will say that 1 2 respect to that, the clients also dictate some this as well. I mean, you know, I'm not sure if 3 you're a client of Dogma but, you know, certainly, my clients take tours of our facility on a daily basis 5 and they are not going to bring their dog to our 6 facility if we're cramming them in there. I mean, 8 that's part of it, too. I mean, you know, I mean --9 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: But I think what Madam Chair is -- what is cramming them in there? I 10 mean, that's the piece of --11 it's difficult 12 MR. STONE: Yes, to 13 quantify. 14 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Yes, yes. 15 MR. STONE: You're right. I mean, it's a I mean, all I can say from the experience 16 challenge. of running the business is that we just found a 17 18 manageable level, which we felt was appropriate and that is the cutoff point on a given day. 19 guess, you know, you perhaps could do it by square 20

for you, quite honestly.

COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay.

foot but, you know, you could do it by employees,

amount of employees. I don't have a good suggestion

MR. STONE: I'm sorry.

NEAL R. GROSS COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS 1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W. WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

21

22

23

24

COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: That's fine. 1 Just a final question for me is in terms of your 2 facility, Mr. Stone and Ms. Welch, complaints, what 3 are you averaging and what is the nature of them? MR. STONE: I have had one complaint that 5 6 I'm aware of. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: In how many 8 years? 9 MR. STONE: Let's see, since 1999. 10 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. 11 MR. STONE: And the complaint was filed 12 resident in the early spring and it 13 partially my fault, because they had their windows open and I had my windows open and that was a 14 I should have shut the windows, which we 15 mistake. usually do, but it was a nice day. 16 17 I had the windows open. The dogs were The sound went out my window right into 18 We quickly fixed that, turned the 19 conditioner on a little earlier than we anticipated, 20 shut the windows and it was fine. 21 And the same for me. 22 MS. WELCH: 23 we had -- there is a condominium building behind us. 24 There is an alleyway and then there is a condo

building, and the president came over and said great,

glad that you're here. However, we can hear some 1 2 dogs barking. So we went back, we listened and we remedied it. 3 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okav. We, you know, just put in 5 WELCH: 6 some soundproofing and that was that. COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: Okay. Thank you. 8 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thanks to the panel 9 and thank you all for coming down tonight. MS. WELCH: Thank you very much. 10 11 MR. STONE: Thank you. 12 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Now, we will have 13 Andrea Doughty, Al Collins, Robert Featherstone and Rebecca, I'm going to give this a try, Besgyer. 14 15 MS. BESGYER: You got it. 16 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Ms. Doughty, let's 17 start with you. 18 MS. DOUGHTY: Hello. My name is Andrea Doughty and I am speaking on behalf of the Q Street 19 20 Association, which is an unincorporated association of residents located on the 1400 Block of Q Street. 21 We have about 80 members. 22 23 I would like to draw your attention to 24 our letter, I think one of the Commissioners already 25 mentioned it, the letter dated October 31^{st} , and I

would like to make a few brief points about our views. We believe that the very significant noise and odor impacts of dog boarding make the regulations that are proposed by the Office of Planning essential.

As has been discussed, dog barking noise is extremely loud. It's between 70 and 90 decibels up to 100 decibels. It far exceeds the maximum permissible noise limits in the Commercial Zones and even the limits in the Industrial Zone. So we're talking about extremely loud noise here when it happens.

It's also extremely difficult to enforce the noise regulations against dog barking noise. It's of a special nature, because it's random and intermittent. In other words, by the time somebody comes along to try and, you know, cite, issue a citation against the noise, the noise will have stopped.

So it really presents quite difficult enforcement challenges. For that reason, we believe that the impact of dog barking noise at commercial facilities is much more readily dealt with via Zoning Regulations governing the use.

We strongly support the special exception

process proposed by the Office of Planning for dog boarding in the Commercial Zones. We think that the special exception process is appropriate to these cases, because it allows the BZA to require these impacts to be mitigated through exactly the kinds of things that you have been talking about, soundproofing of buildings, sanitary systems dealing with waste and odor, air filtration, etcetera.

think that a special exception is really the mechanism that allows these kinds impacts to be taken into account by the BZA. allows the BZA to take into account unique circumstances, and we heard about one facility, Dogma, that has kind of unique locational some characteristics to it.

Now, there will be other cases, which also have unique locational or other characteristics, and a special exception process allows the BZA to really take those into consideration in a way that we cannot do necessarily when we're writing regulations. We can't write them into the regulations to cover every circumstance.

The use of the special exception process that is proposed has a direct parallel in the current

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

zoning treatment of motorcycle sales and repair under section 727 of the regulations. That's motorcycles, again, are extremely -- create a lot of noise.

Their use is very similar in terms of its zoning impact and under the regulations for C-2 at present, motorcycle sales and repair is dealt with as a special exception. So, you know, we think that by treating dog boarding this way, you're doing exactly the right thing.

Because of the noise impact and the special nature of the enforcement problem with the noise impact, we completely agree with the Office of Planning that the use of exterior yards for dog boarding is incompatible in the densely populated Commercial Zones, and that dog boarding uses in general are not appropriate in locations that abut Residential Zones. So we support what is currently proposed by OP in those two areas.

However, there are two areas where we believe that the proposed regulations don't adequately address the issues. We don't support OP's latest proposal on dog grooming. We believe that the only restriction that is proposed right now is that no pets be allowed to stay overnight in grooming facilities. We don't think that that is adequate for

a lot of the reasons that have been discussed by the 1 2 previous panel. Grooming facilities have large numbers of 3 dogs on their premises for 8 to 10 hours at a time, and those dogs can create large levels of noise. 5 doesn't matter whether the dogs are there to 6 groomed or there to be boarded, the noise impact can 8 be just the same. that 9 believe grooming should subject to the same zoning regulations as boarding. 10 In particular, we believe that grooming should take 11 12 place wholly within --13 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I need you to wrap it up, because you just ran out of time. 14 15 MS. DOUGHTY: Oh, okay. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Could you just give 16 17 us a closing thought, and we do have your letter in the record. 18 We believe that 19 MS. DOUGHTY: Okay. grooming should take place within wholly enclosed 20 and that there should be 21 structures no 22 exterior yards, and that those facilities should also be set back from Residential Zones in the same way 23 24 that dog boarding is. 25 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Mr.

Collins?

MR. COLLINS: All right. Thanks for the opportunity to speak. My name is Al Collins and I, too, live on the 1400 Block of Q Street. I wanted to speak about enforcement, in particular enforcement in three areas, noise, waste and odor and then dog grooming versus dog boarding.

Yesterday there was a hearing that Council Member Graham held at 10:00 a.m. that was entitled Noise Issues and Enforcement in Residential and Commercial Areas. I attended that hearing, because I have been very challenged by the noise from a kennel on my block and I wanted to see what other people had to say about their noise issues and their enforcement issues.

I left very saddened, because basically there is no enforcement mechanism for noise in general in the city, except for -- there are regs, but there is just no way to enforce them, except for noise from a bar and ABRA, the Alcohol Board Regulatory Authority, has some trained inspectors that carry noise meters.

Our or my experience with trying to get noise issues dealt with on the block were calling DCRA who told me to call the Metropolitan Police

Department, and then calling the Metropolitan Police Department who told me to call DCRA.

This for weeks actually on or resolution months, and the myself and was neighbors pooling our money together, thousands of dollars, to buy our own noise meter, hiring the same professional, licensed professional, to calibrate it take the readings and pursuing this potentially civil manner, which is what DCRA told us we would have to do and the Police Department told us we would have to do even though the regs have a decibel level in them, and I find that unacceptable.

And when I look at 735.2, which is the reg, the proposed reg that says "shall create no objectionable conditions to adjacent properties resulting from animal noise, waste and odor," I am just concerned that that's just not going to be enough to really enforce.

So we have got to look at this in a realistic manner. There is nobody to enforce it and it's not going to get enforced, so we're going to have to look at other factors that, you know, hopefully will compel more harmony among neighbors and these facilities.

Waste and odor, another really

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

challenging situation for me. The kennel on my block, their waste management system -- and let me say I am the Director of Health, Environment and Safety for a very large petroleum company, Multinational, that owns chemical companies, mines, pipelines, trucking. Anyway, I am pretty familiar with the OSHA safety regs. Theirs was to take a hose and hose the dog feces from their back yard into the alley.

And for two years we called the Health Department who referred us back to the Police Department and vice versa and it was never taken care of and it's disgusting.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I need you to wrap up.

MR. COLLINS: Okay. Lastly, dog groomers masquerading as dog boarders. How are we going to enforce that? I mean, let's be serious. The one on my block has a business plan or I have heard they have a business plan to turn themselves into a groomer.

People are going to drop them off in the boarding. They are going to keep them all day and pick them up in the evening and we're going to be left with the same issues if groomers are not

included as boarders. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And if you had anything to add, you can always submit a written statement for the record.

MR. COLLINS: Thanks for your patience.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Mr. Featherstone?

MR. FEATHERSTONE: Thank you very much for letting me speak. I am a resident of 1408 Q Street and, therefore, I became interested in this issue because of the opening of the dog boarding facility two doors from me. I am very appreciative of the Office of Planning and the Zoning Commission by actually considering regulations that would address this.

My one concern is that the regulations that would cover dog boarding do not include dog grooming and, as others have spoken, my concern and the concern of my neighbors is that a dog grooming facility could become a stealth dog boarding facility. The dogs are delivered in the morning. They are picked up in the afternoon.

And my question would be what level of grooming constitutes grooming? I know some people leave the house with only a cursory level of grooming and no one notices. I would hate to think of someone

bringing a dog in every day to be groomed. That's really all I have to say.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Ms. Besgyer?

MS. BESGYER: Hello. My name is Rebecca
Besgyer and I am the owner of Dogma Day Care for
Dogs. Thanks for letting me speak today. I opened
Dogma eight years ago. I was the first person to
open a group play facility, a dog group play

facility, in the District.

And I just want to say before I get into what I'm going to say that I know we have talked a lot about dog grooming, but just for one second I want to say that what you're worried about happening or what I have heard people say they are worried with dog grooming about happening is already happening with pet shops, because I know of three pet shops that are stealth boarding facilities without a license for it or without saying it on their Certificate of Occupancy.

And, you know, I feel like we're trying as hard as we can to remain compliant with the law and, yet, there is already kind of a backwash of things happening, you know. All right.

So I opened Dogma eight years ago and I live in the same northwest neighborhood that all of

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

these facilities and Andrea lives in, and I would have loved to open up in northwest Washington, except that I knew, based on what I wanted to do, I was not going to find an appropriate facility in that area.

And so I looked specifically for the most isolated spot that I could possibly find which was, at the time I opened, in an Industrial Zone. And I found a site, because what I wanted to do was -- I knew I had to introduce the concept of group play and dog day care to the residents, and I knew that the last thing I could afford to do was to have an acrimonious relationship with those people around me.

And so I didn't choose a site that had any visibility whatsoever and there was a certain cost to that. There still is today. I meet longtime Hill residents that still have no idea we are on the Hill. They have absolutely no idea, because my street is a one way dead end street. It is bordered on three sides by freeway, park or roadway.

It's sandwiched between the Marine barracks and the Navy Yard. And when I opened, the entire block was basically -- it was a site for refuse of all kinds from the squatters that lived in the abandoned buildings or the vacant buildings. My building was vacant for at least 15 years. I think

it was more like 20.

And we cleaned up the site and we have had an impact on the neighborhood, but it hasn't been a bad impact on the neighborhood. It has been a good one. We have never had one complaint in the eight years we have been operating. We don't even have an impact on the traffic, because there isn't any traffic on our street.

So unlike a center that might be located in a downtown area where if you have got 40 drop-offs in the morning that might be a problem, we don't even have that kind of an impact. We have always dealt with waste removal the proper way. We would never consider hosing it anywhere.

That was an interesting thing actually, because the District told me that I needed -- when I first opened, they required me to install \$5,000 floor drains, so I could hose the waste down them. And even though we explained that that wasn't how we could do it, they still wouldn't let me have my Certificate of Occupancy before I complied, so we had to tear up the floor. We have never used them once. We put horse mats over them that weigh 100 pounds each, so we have a waste removal company that comes in.

The facility is -- my capacity is partly determined by my outdoor space. We have 7,000 square feet of outdoor space. We have it securely fenced. The building is not very big. We actually have two It's not very large and if my yard was compliant, if determined to be not it compliant with the law, well, I would go business immediately. You would put me out business effectively.

I think I have already borne some costs from selecting, responsibly selecting, a site where I knew there wasn't going to be any negative impact to the neighborhood. We have been very active in neighborhood charities, setting up a community garden next door in the park. We have worked very hard to support Barracks Row Main Street and have been contributors to that.

And I also wanted to pass out, so you can get a better idea of what we're talking about, some maps.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You have to stay on the mike.

MS. BESGYER: Okay. I have got six copies of maps here, but I also have some photos that say the direction that it's showing from the yards.

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Don't keep talking, 1 2 because I need you on the mike. The other thing is if we MS. BESGYER: 3 had to go through a special exception, I just want to say that that would be a very difficult process for 5 We would have to bear the additional cost, which 6 I have heard could be as much as \$25,000 to get a 8 zoning attorney to go through the process. 9 I looked through what was required, the just for the preparation of the special 10 points, 11 exception and there are 37 separate points. As a small business owner that works a lot and doesn't 12 13 have a lot of time, we have spent a long time trying to clarify why our position is a little bit different 14 than everyone else's and we want to make sure that, 15 again, we're not penalized for doing a good job with 16 no regulatory body that looked after us at first. 17 18 I mean, we made some very responsible decisions and we have 2,000 clients, as well, most of 19 whom are District residents that would all be willing 20 to testify to that. I really would urge --21 22 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You're actually out 23 of time. 24 MS. BESGYER: I'm sorry. 25 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So could you just

wrap it up?

MS. BESGYER: Yes. I just wanted to urge you to, please, consider either approving exterior yards in general in the amendment or grandfather my existing yard or use your power to act as the BZA, at the same time when you adopt the new regulations to grant my facility a special exception to operate the yard.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.

MS. BESGYER: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: It's helpful to have the map that you have given us, and I think what would be further helpful, so that we can have a better understanding of your facility is if you had - if we could get a plat of some kind, like a site plan. I think the Office of Planning can help you get that if you need help.

MS. BESGYER: Uh-huh.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And also, you had mentioned that you were originally zoned industrial and now you're zoned C-3-A.

MS. BESGYER: Yes. The owner of my property is -- he was living in San Diego, but now he lives in Italy, and I don't usually see that correspondence and I didn't -- I don't watch for

those hearings as they come up. 1 2 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: MS. BESGYER: But it was originally zoned 3 light industrial. I don't know what the number was. CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: 5 Okay. But I know that the last 6 MS. BESGYER: 7 time when we went, there had been a change. 8 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: And what do you have 9 a Certificate of Occupancy for now? The certificate says 24 10 MS. BESGYER: 11 hour dog care, dog care facility. Is that what it Yes, 24 hour dog care facility. 12 I was one of 13 the three that was given a new Certificate of 14 Occupancy. 15 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. And actually, if you could submit a copy of the Certificate of 16 Occupancy, so that we would know. I don't know if it 17 18 applies to a single lot or multiple lots but, you know, just so we can identify the legal entity and 19 all of that as we move through this and decide how we 20 want to handle your particular case. 21 22 MS. BESGYER: Okay. I think it's 23 multiple lots. I'm not certain. 24 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. But if you 25 could just --

MS. BESGYER: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: -- give us all that information.

MS. BESGYER: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So we're as informed as we can be about that.

MS. BESGYER: I will be happy to.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay. Other questions from the Commission?

VICE CHAIR HOOD: Madam Chair, I just wanted to ask Mr. Collins. You mentioned 735.2 about the enforcement and that's one issue, but can you help us to maybe strengthen that to how you see it may need to be strengthened. You don't have to do it now. If you can submit something or if you could maybe tell me how we could strengthen that.

MR. COLLINS: Well, I think that you would have to define what an objectionable condition would be in the definitions, and that would probably have to be something -- you know, if there was -- I want to say before I say this that the kennel owners that we have worked together with have been amazing and I have learned so much and this is really -- actually, I'm probably not even going to say that, because it's not a good solution.

I was going to. I would rather 1 something in writing. But I think defining that 2 definition and explaining what an objectionable 3 condition is, which there is a lot of regulatory quidance in other parts of the D.C. Code, would be a 5 way of doing that and it has to do with hearings and 6 that kind of stuff. 8 VICE CHAIR HOOD: Okay. I would be 9 interested in seeing it. If you have time to submit something, that would be great. Thank you. 10 11 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Anyone else, 12 questions? 13 COMMISSIONER JEFFRIES: I just love these photographs. This is great. 14 15 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: I just wanted to empathize for a minute with Mr. Collins. I dealt in 16 my -- where I live, which is southern Dupont Circle, 17 18 with another issue not related to dogs at all, but it is next to impossible, as you say, to get any kind of 19 noise enforcement. 20 21 So anything that we can get ordinance that would, basically, require people to 22 23 meet a standard at the special exception stage, 24 rather than trying to enforce it after the fact, I

think would be all to the good, because it puts the

burden on the business owner at the commencement of the process. So thank you all for coming down.

And now I have Mark O'Brien, and if there is anyone else who would like to testify in support, you can feel free to come forward now. And Mr. O'Brien won't be lonely then if you come forward. Let me just ask this. Anybody who has come in, I see some faces that we didn't have in the hearing room when we started, there's two little cards. I don't know if you have --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We have done it.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You gave those in already? Okay. I just wanted to make sure everybody had the cards filled out. So we'll start with Mr. O'Brien, then we'll work our way down the table.

MR. O'BRIEN: Thank you for letting me speak. I am Mark O'Brien, a resident of 1417 Q Street.

First, I would like to note that I fully support the arguments that have already been made by the other members or other residents of Q Street and other people who have spoken and the owners of the three dog boarding businesses, Dogs by Day, Dogma and City Dogs.

And I would also like to urge the

NEAL R. GROSS

Commission to review the possibility of grandfathering, sorry, grandfathering the existing exterior yard Dogma on the grounds of the at particularities of where it's located and its history at that site if that's possible.

Where I would like to focus my comments is on the issue of the appropriate treatment of dog grooming and the proposed text amendment concerning dog boarding. As has already been noted by earlier speakers, the amendment needs to cover grooming simply to avoid leaving a loophole in the regulations through which dog boarding business masquerading as groomers could walk. I think that would be unfair to the other dog boarding businesses who operate within the law and also to the residents.

In support of my views, I would like to refer to how some other jurisdictions have looked at this issue of regulating dog grooming as a use in Zoning Regulations. I have looked especially at some of the more densely populated urban contexts throughout the country. Some of these jurisdictions have addressed these issues before D.C. has got around to it, and it seems to me it would make sense to review their way of doing things, so as to learn from that and not have to reinvent the wheel.

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I should point out that I am not a legal or a zoning expert, so my reading of a range of Zoning Regulations has been from the perspective only of an interested party, and my reading has not been comprehensive, simply limited by my available spare time.

As an aside, one of the issues you raised earlier, which was potential gaps in the definitions which you might want to avoid, I noticed that in a number of regulations they avoid the use of dog as in dog grooming or dog boarding and simply say animal, animal grooming, animal boarding, animal hospital, which might be something you could bear in mind.

From my research, there have been two common ways that the issue of the need to regulate dog grooming as a use has been addressed elsewhere. First, and perhaps based on a view that dog grooming itself has an impact, but potentially a lesser impact overnight boarding, than some jurisdictions differentiate between boarding and grooming as uses. Grooming is still identified as а use in the regulations, but subject to lesser ascriptions on the use, presumably reflecting a view that the impact is less than that of boarding.

San Francisco seems to me to be an

NEAL R. GROSS

1

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

interesting, a fairly thorough example of this approach. In San Francisco a differentiation is made between groomers who board overnight and those who do not. Both are controlled, but where overnight boarding is involved, the business is grouped with vet hospitals and the standards that have to be met are much tighter, virtually the same as kennels. I have to say this approach, however, is very complex and might be hard to implement.

More frequently, however, it seems from my research that jurisdictions opt to group all of these activities together, that's grooming and boarding, and sometimes vet hospitals and treat them as similar for the purposes of the Zoning Regs, and I think that's probably because it's hard to differentiate the use at the margin.

Examples I have looked at include Orlando, Florida, San Jose, California, Tacoma, Washington, Ann Arbor, Michigan and several others which are referred to in the letter that has been jointly sent by a number of people to you.

What is interesting to me is that irrespective of which approach you follow, whether it's the separate dog grooming out as a use or lump it in with all other dog boarding and other uses is

confusing myself. 2 Irrespective of which approach is taken, 3 all the jurisdictions seem to include some measures to limit the impact of dog grooming. In virtually 5 all cases, the businesses are required to be carried 6 out only inside a fully enclosed building, 8 exterior yards of any sort for dog grooming. 9 few cases there are requirements for soundproofing and even in one jurisdiction I looked at, a specific 10 requirement for specially soundproofed windows. 11 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You're out of time. 12 13 MR. O'BRIEN: Okay. 14 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Can you give us your 15 closing thoughts and then if you had a written statement that you wanted to submit. 16 MR. O'BRIEN: 17 Sure. 18 CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: You have got lots of good stuff in there, I think. 19 20 MR. O'BRIEN: Okay. I was going to mention setbacks are also common. 21 I was going to 22 mention they are also all over the place, just as you 23 referred to before, with the number of dogs 24 square foot. Some places do look at dogs per square 25 foot, again all the place, and some over

how dog grooming as a use is addressed.

jurisdictions refer to health regulations for that purpose. And my final point was to say I was happy to submit this stuff in writing.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Fabulous. Thanks. We're just going to move down the table since I don't know the names of the rest of the folks.

MS. GUGGENHEIM: Hi. Nice to be here. My name is Grace Guggenheim and I live in the District up near the zoo in northwest, and I am here sort of as representing as a single professional D.C. resident, just here in support of how important these facilities are for someone like myself who is really operating as sort of a single parent with a dog.

And I'm here primarily in support of Dogma and not to discriminate these other wonderful facilities, but ironically I drive all the way down to southwest to take my dog to Dogma and, primarily, this is my second dog, but he had sort of a special need in the fact that he needed an outdoor facility. He needed a facility that had an outdoor/indoor component and also a high socialization place with a lot of care, and I specifically drive two to three times a week to take my dog down to Dogma.

And I just wanted to be here in support of this facility, because I feel that they do an

exceptional job, they are very caring, dedicated staff, and it's really a vital component to my working life and professional life and also really allowing me to have a dog that has really grown to be a very mature, wonderful animal.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Ma'am?

MS. KHANDWALA: Gopa Khandwala. I am a

District resident. I live on Capitol Hill. I work

on Capitol Hill. I have five dogs of my own and yes,

I do have a hobby permit. I also foster several dogs

and frequently have friends' dogs staying with me.

So as someone who has often had up to 10 dogs in a townhouse, I would like to talk a little bit about some of the benefits of a place like Dogma. My dogs do go to Dogma. Some of my fosters have been there. Some of my friends take their dogs there, too, and I wanted to talk a little bit about the exterior yard and to really support the request for grandfathering it in.

In addition to all of that, I have also worked at times at Dogma as a caretaker. Rebecca is very particular about having adequate qualified staff at any point, and I think the first time we spoke on the phone with the numerous dogs in the background, we decided I was qualified.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

I wanted to address a couple of things that haven't been addressed otherwise, rather than repeating everything. Firstly, the question that you all had raised about the number of dogs per square foot that could be advisable, I just wanted to say in some respects this business regulates itself. If you have too many dogs in a place when you take into account the environment and the staff that's present, dog fights will break out and dogs will get injured and you will lose clients.

So if you run a dog boarding facility, chances are that itself will regulate how many dogs you have rather than even noise considerations, because you're going to have the fights before you even hit that excessive noise possibility based on just areas.

I have spent several nights at Dogma, because it's also -- since it's 24 hour, there is at least one person there at night, and it has not been an issue. The only time I was ever woken up there was by a bunch of drunks walking by, never by the dogs. It is in the middle of a commercial area and it's not an area that is going to be changing into residential in my lifetime.

The last thing I wanted to talk about a

little bit is the waste disposal. When I started at Dogma, the first thing Rebecca did was show me around and show me what needs to be done with waste disposal. It's picked up as soon as it's dropped. The entire yard is sprayed with disinfectant every couple of hours. The entire yard is bleached at least twice a day, if not more frequently.

It really doesn't matter which way the wind blows, you don't smell a thing, and I personally have a compromised immune system. It has never been a health concern for me to be at Dogma and that's saying a lot. So I would be happy to answer any questions, but that's it.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Sir?

MR. WEAVER: Hi. My name is William Weaver and I live in northwest Washington, in Mount Pleasant, and I'm a customer of Dogma and I have many, many options. Well, not many, many, but I have several options for dog boarding and specifically go to Dogma because of the outside area. It's the hallmark of their business and that's why I'm a customer.

And you know, frankly, if it wasn't available, there are certainly many other, you know, businesses that are certainly closer to me. So I

would worry about the viability of her business if she wasn't able to keep that outside boarding facility.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Thank you. Any questions for the panel? Any questions? Okay. Thank you all for coming down and, Mr. O'Brien, we look forward to getting your written statement in the record.

Anyone else who would like to testify in support, anyone else? Anyone who would like to testify in opposition?

Okay. I would like to, since we will have a second case to take up the grooming, because we have to have -- this hearing is what the public hearing notice noticed to the public and not everybody -- grooming has come up as an issue, but it's not because it was noticed.

So the Office of Planning will make a further proposal to us and we'll schedule a hearing on dog grooming or animal grooming and perhaps other things like veterinary hospital and so on. So I would encourage you all to come back and put your concerns on the record at that time.

And we will leave the record open, because we would like to get some of the written

statements that we asked for. We would like to get some more information from Ms. Besgyer and then we would like to get some further guidance from the Office of Planning on perhaps some parameters that we could include in the ordinance when the BZA is considering special exception requirements related to the things that we heard, particularly about noise and how the buildings themselves can be structured, so that that is less of a problem or is eliminated as a problem.

So I think we should leave the record open for probably whatever would work to get things in for our December meeting.

MS. SCHELLIN: December. We could leave the record open until Monday, December $5^{\rm th}$.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: Okay.

MS. SCHELLIN: 3:00 p.m.

CHAIRPERSON MITTEN: So any written statements, if you have any additional thoughts, want to do any additional research, the record will be open until December 5^{th} at 3:00.

And I just want to explain to folks what will happen next. We'll make the decision on this case at one of our regular monthly meetings, and it's likely if we get all the materials in on time that

that will be the December meeting, and we hold them in the same room at 6:30 on the second Monday of the month.

And if you're interested in following the case, you can contact Mrs. Schellin in the Office of Zoning and she will be able to tell you whether, in fact, the case would be on for a particular meeting. But you should also be aware that if we propose affirmative action, because this is a rule making case, the proposed action will be published in the D.C. Register as a proposed rule making and there will be an additional period of time for public comment.

And in addition, we make a referral to the National Capital Planning Commission and they review it for a federal impact review. The Zoning Commission then -- so we take proposed action, publish a rule making, refer to NCPC and then we take final action at a subsequent public meeting. And so a lot of things to do in the meantime, and then we have this additional case that will be coming forward on the animal grooming and other things.

So thank you all for coming down. You have clearly taken a serious interest in this and your testimony has been very helpful this evening.

was

1	Th	ank	you.	. V	We're	adjo	ourne	ed.			
2					(Wher	reupo	n,	the	Publ	ic	Hearing
3	со	nclu	ıded	at	8:01	p.m.	.)				
4											
5											
6											
7											
8											
9											
10											
11											
12											
13											
14											
15											
16											
17											
18											
19											
20											
21											
22											